



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## V.—CRITICAL NOTES ON THE DIALOGUS OF TACITUS.

The notes and emendations here offered have grown out of the preparation of a critical and exegetical edition of the *Dialogus*.

### FIRST PAPER.

1. Ch. I 14 H. : Ita non ingenio sed memoria et recordatione opus est, ut quae a praestantissimis viris et excogitata subtiliter et dicta graviter accepi, cum singuli diversas [vel easdem] sed probabiles causas afferrent . . . neque enim defuit qui diversam quoque partem susciperet, etc.

*Accepi* cannot be the correct reading here, for Tacitus uses this verb in the sense of *audire* only of information imparted by tradition or at second hand (cf. D. 12, 19; 28, 25; 30, 9; 40, 14, and so consistently in numerous passages of his later works), whereas *knowledge acquired directly from the living lips of the speaker*, as in the passage under notice, is expressed by *excipere* (cf. e. g. D. 2, 10; 15, 3; 29, 15; Ag. 45, 19; Hist. III 85, 5; IV 46, 26). I, therefore, write: E praestantissimis viris . . . EXCEPI.<sup>1</sup> *Accipere*, being by far the more familiar word, easily took the place of *excipere*, and so we actually find the identical error in 2, 10, where EV<sup>2</sup> have *acciperem* for the genuine *exciperem* of the other MSS, and, especially analogous, Quint. X 1, 86, where the majority of our MSS reads: *ab Afro Domitio iuvenis accepi*, in place of the universally accepted reading: *ex Afro . . . excepi* (cf. Spalding ad loc.). The use of the same verb within a few lines is, of course, no more objectionable than the repetition of *diversus* immediately below, or that of *ingenium*, which occurs no fewer than five times in this very chapter (cf. also Nipp. ad Ann. I 81, and Joh. Müller, Beiträge z. Krit. des

<sup>1</sup>E instead of *ex* is written advisedly, for out of 60 examples in Tacitus, in which this preposition precedes a word beginning with *p*, *ex* is found only a dozen times, but of these, *six* occur in the stereotype phrase *ex parte*, while in the other instances the MSS exhibit both forms.

<sup>2</sup>V = cod. Vindob. (cf. Scheuer, Bresl. Abth. VI 1 p.). In the designation of the other MSS I follow Michaelis.  $\omega$  = omnes vel reliqui libri.

Tac. IV 11-18). The dread of repetition is chiefly a modern stylistic sentimentality; cp. the sensible remarks of Quint. X 1, 17 on this point.

As for the rest of the sentence, I unhesitatingly follow Lipsius in rejecting *vel easdem* as an interpolation, this being the only conjecture of the many that have been proposed which admits of a rational explanation of the origin of the corruption and, at the same time, completely satisfies the sense. *Veleadem* is the gloss of some ancient reader who believed the arguments of Maternus, Messalla and Secundus to be identical, which is perfectly true in so far as they all agree as regards the *actuality* of the decline of eloquence. Cf. 16, 12: nec aequo animo [sc. Aprum] perferre *hanc nostram pro antiquorum laude concordiam*. Aper, on the other hand, so far from offering any causes for this decline, vehemently denies its very existence. Hence it follows that he cannot be included among the *singuli*,<sup>1</sup> as has generally been maintained; in fact, if I mistake not, Tacitus intended to prevent this same misinterpretation by the addition of the next clause—*enim* having all the force of γάρ: "The several speakers advanced different, but withal plausible reasons for the decline of eloquence, nor was there also one wanting, as I would have you know, who took quite the opposite side."

Ch. 5, 11: et ego enim quatenus arbitrum litis huius inveni, non patiar Maternum societate plurium defendi sed ipsum solum apud vos arguam, etc.

et, ω, John del. *Pithoeus*, editt. inveni, *corr. Pithoeus* (invenimus, *Vahlen*); inveniri, ABCEV; invenire, D; inveniri non puto, *Andresen*; arbiter—inveniri non potuit, *John*; quando te nunc inveni, *Muretus*; quia te nunc inveni, *Ruperti*, *E. Wolff*; licet litis huius i., *Stending*; litis huius licet i., *Philipp*; iuvat inveniri, *Ribbeck*; at ego omnino inveniri spero, *Hoerschelmann*; nego enim alienum arbitrum inveniri quatenus, *Baehrens*; eos, ABCEV; ipsos, D; vos, *Lipsius*, *Nipperdey*, *Peter*, *Halm*, *Vahlen*, *Joh. Müller*; te, *Muretus*, *Wolff*; eum, *Spengel*, *Michaelis*; se, *Andresen*, *Baehrens*; nos, *John*.

<sup>1</sup> A similar careless use of the word is found in ch. 14, 2, where *Tacitus*, be it observed, not *Messalla*, says: suspicatusque ex ipsa intentione *singulorum* altiorum inter *eos* esse sermonem, but Secundus took no part in the debate referred to. Therefore, *singulorum* is inaccurate.

Andresen's (Act. Soc. Lips. I, p. 135 f.) and John's (Correspbl. f. d. Gelehrt. u. Real. Würtemb. 1886, p. 1 f.) remarks have, I think, in spite of W. Gilbert, Fleck. Jhrb., 133, p. 203 ff., irrefutably shown that Aper yields to Secundus' request to be excused from acting as judge in the contemplated debate.<sup>1</sup> If so, the clause beginning with *quatenus* must contain a negative idea. Andresen has supplied this by inserting *non puto*. But, as John justly remarks, we would in that case rather expect the fut. inf. He himself conjectures: *arbitr . . . inveniri non potuit*, but this involves an additional change. A much easier emendation than either, and equally satisfactory to the sense here required, is to write: *NON inveni*, the similarity of the initial letters of *inveni* causing the omission of *n* (i. e. *non*).<sup>2</sup>

*Eos*, the reading of all but one of our MSS, was changed by Lipsius into *vos*, a conjecture which has met with no little favor. But as this reading would necessarily include the author of the Dialogus himself, it need not be considered seriously, for even if the writer had not kept himself studiously in the background, it is absurd to suppose that Aper would have asked his youthful follower to sit in judgment upon Maternus. *Te* is also out of the question, as this correction is based upon the erroneous assumption that Secundus assumed the role of arbiter. *Eum* or *se* might possibly be defended with some degree of success. By far the most satisfactory suggestion, however, is that of John, who, running the gamut of possibilities, writes *nos*. The variant *ipsos* in D seems to me to have preserved a clue to the origin of the corruption. The archetype had it . . . *os*, the lacuna being erroneously supplied by the copyists.

Ch. 6, 30: *nam in ingenio quoque sicut in agro, quamquam alia diu serantur atque elaborantur, gratiora tamen quae sua sponte nascuntur.*

<sup>1</sup> It may be added in confirmation of this view, that the author of the Dialogus would have proved himself a very clumsy artist indeed, had he set all this machinery at work only to abandon it, for Secundus does not appear in the capacity of judge at all. The little introductory episode is, however, highly appropriate for bringing the attitude of the interlocutors into bold relief, and this was doubtless Tacitus' intention.

<sup>2</sup> This emendation has been *accidentally* anticipated by Gerber-Greef, Lex. Tacit., where s. v. *enim* our passage is thus quoted, and without comment: 'arbitrum litis non inveni, non patiar,' with the omission of *huius*, whereas ss. vv. *arbitr, inveni, hic, lis*, and *non*, their citation agrees with the vulgate text!

alia, ABEV; om. CD, *Steuding* (Fleck. Jahrb. 135, p. 627); utilia (utiliora), *Ernesti*; solidiora ser. diuque elab., *Peerkamp*; solidiora quae ser. atque elab., *Andresen*; dulcia quae industria, *Weinkauff*; diurtuna ser., *Bachrens*; valida diu ser., *Cornelissen*.

A few scholars, ignoring the significant omission of *alia* in two MSS, have endeavored to defend the otherwise inexplicable reading on the analogy of a well-known Greek idiom. This construction does not, however, occur elsewhere in Latin, nor does one quite understand why Tacitus should in this instance have had recourse to it, especially since no other Grecisms (with the possible exception of *tamquam* = ὥς, for which cp. Wölfflin, Phil. 24, p. 115 f.) are found in the Dialogus. *Steuding* regards *alia* as an interpolation, but this leaves the *quamquam* clause without a subject and a predicate,<sup>1</sup> not to mention the intrinsic improbability of an insertion of a word which can only be explained on the assumption of a Grecism!

It were also an easy task to refute the emendations given above, which destroy the obvious sense of the passage and depart too far from the MS reading; but refutation becomes unnecessary the moment it is observed that *alia* is nothing more nor less than the corruption of a dittography of *diu*, the *d* being mistaken for *al*, just as in the following very analogous instances we find a confusion between *d* and *ol*: 21, 18, *reddent* in CD for *redolent*. In 33, 10 *solum* was corrupted into an inexplicable *dum*, ABCDEV (*tantum*, which Ritter and Halm prefer to Dronke's emendation, does not explain the corruption). So, again, according to Haupt's ingenious suggestion (Opusc. III 47) *victor violens* in Hor. Sat. I 10, 37 should read *victo. ridens*, and according to Andresen *induerit* (in 6, 18) arose out of an original *voluerit*. The parent MS of CD (on their intimate relationship cf. Scheuer, l. c., p. 17 ff.) recognized the *diu* as a dittography, and therefore omitted it; the archetype of the other MSS, however, mistook *diu* for *alia*, hence our variants.

The *alia* being thus disposed of—and with its omission all conjectures and interpretations based upon it fall to the ground—it

<sup>1</sup> The bold ellipsis of a positive to be supplied as a predicate from a following comparative seems to occur but *once* in Tacitus, and that in one of his very latest books, Ann. 15, 1: Tiridates quoque regni profugus per silentium [sc. gravis] aut modice querendo gravior erat. Even if the later works did contain more examples of this construction, it would still be inadmissible in the Dialogus.

remains to emend the incomplete sentence in a way that will bring out its obvious meaning without doing violence to the text. Both of these prerequisite conditions are fully complied with, if we read: *quamquam QUAE diu serantur atque elaborentur GRATA, gratiora tamen quae sua sponte nascuntur. Quae* (i. e. *q*; or *q̄*.) was easily dropped after *quamquam* (i. e. *quamq̄*; cf. D. 18, 27; 32, 4. 19). For similar omissions cf. e. g. ch. 3, 2, *ipsum quem* for *ipsumque quem*. 39, 25: *quoque qui*, ω, *quoque*, D; cf. also Buecheler, Rh. Mus. XI 512 f. "It is with the mind as with the field, for, while those things which are sown and cultivated for a long time are pleasing, yet more pleasing are those that grow of their own accord."

Ch. 7, 10: *Tum mihi supra tribunatus et praeturas et consulatus ascendere videor, tum habere quod si non in alio oritur nec codicillis datur nec cum gratia venit.*

*alio*, ABCDE *aliquo*, Ritter, Peter, Halm, Wolff; *si non in animo*, Freinsheim, Joh. Müller; *si non in ipso*, non ab *alio*, Nipperdey; *si*, del. Michaelis; *quod in se non in alio*, Rutgersius; *in ipso*, Ernesti; *in naturali oboritur*, Doederlein; *ingenio*, Seebode; *in nobis*, Schopen; *sola indole*, Ribbeck; *intus*, Usener; *numine aliquo*, Sillig; *naturale*, Baehrens; *natalibus paritur*, Andresen; *proelio*, Dryander; 'quod—oritur,' del. olim Ritter.

Quot homines, tot sententiae! With the exception of *aliquo*, however, none of the above enumerated conjectures possesses the slightest paleographical probability; they are only valuable in so far as they indicate the impossibility of a satisfactory explanation of the MS reading. Ritter's emendation, though certainly an easy one, is nevertheless untenable, because the pronoun *aliquis* is altogether too indefinite a word in this place, and hence even its supporters are compelled to invest the preposition *in* with an emphasis which it never has. I conjectured *alvo*; an emendation, as I subsequently learned, long ago anticipated by Pithoeus, though persistently ignored since the days of Lipsius, who contemptuously dismisses it, as being quite unintelligible.<sup>1</sup> *Alvus* is, however, frequently used in the sense of *uterus*, with or without *matris*, this addition being superfluous where the context or some word (as *oritur* in the present instance) precludes any possible

<sup>1</sup> Baehrens also casually mentions the conjecture in his critical commentary, but omits it in his *adnotatio critica*.

ambiguity. Cf. Plaut. Stich. II 1, 15; Cic. pro Cluentio I 12; de div. I 20; Hor. A. P. 340. The thought, moreover, is exactly paralleled by a passage in the Dial. 29, 10: huius urbis vitia paene in utero matris concipitur. Cf. also Pall. IV 12: vixdum concepta in alvo vitiatur.<sup>1</sup>

Ch. 8, 4: Ausim contendere Marcellum hunc Eprum . . . Crispum Vibium (. . . utor) . . . non minus esse in extremis partibus terrarum quam Capuae aut Vercellae, ubi nati dicuntur.

minus, ABCDEV, *Peter*; notos *post* minus *ins.*, *Ursinus*, *Nipp.*, *Halm*, *Joh. Müller*, *John*, *Wolff*; *post* utor, *add.* *Sauppe*, *Michaelis*; *post* esse, *Lipsius*; illustres *post* minus, *coll. Ribbeck*, *Andresen*, *Baehrens*; minoris, *Rutgersius*.

The constant shifting in position which the word, first suggested by Ursinus, had to undergo, is a tacit acknowledgment, on the part of the critics, of the very unsatisfactory character of the conjecture. A far more plausible correction, and one that suits the context equally well (Peter's defence of the MS reading need not be considered seriously), is to suppose that *minus* is simply a corruption of *minores*, the word having been abbreviated into *miñ*. For *minores* in the sense of 'inferior in rank, renown or intellect' cf. Dial. 21, 26: nam in orationibus minorem esse fama sua (sc. Brutum) etiam admiratores eius fatentur, Ann. I 13: Gallum Asinium avidum et minorem, *ibid.* XVI 8: mox Neronem . . . quasi minores evasere, XVI 20. Especially frequent in Quint., e. g. I 2, 10: minores . . . praeceptores, II 3, 1: pueros non continuo tradendos *eminentissimo* credunt sed apud *minores* aliquamdiu detinent, II 5, 19: illos minores [sc. scriptores] quia facilius eorum intellectus videbatur, probaverunt; cf. also VI 3, 67; X 1, 60, 74, and Hor. Ep. I 1, 106; II 1, 183.

Ch. 12, 15: nec ullis aut gloria maior aut augustior honor.

The lacuna after *maior*, indicated in our MSS, has been filled out by Ritter by the addition of *erat*, while Michaelis suggested *gloria mortalibus maior*. The latter insertion cannot be accepted,

<sup>1</sup>All still existing doubt as to the certainty of Pithoeus' emendation is now dispelled by Scheuer's accurate collation of the Cod. Vindobonensis, which reads *albo*, i. e. *alvo*. The confusion between *b* and *v* is too common to call for illustrations. Cf., however, e. g. Dial. 7, 4; 8, 2; 16, 2, 4; 20, 22; 25, 33 M. If *albo*, we may add, had been due to some old conjecture, its author would scarcely have spelled the word incorrectly.

because *gloriamor* in our MSS arose out of *gloria maior* by metathesis, a very common source of error; cf. Vahlen, Berl. Prooem. 1881, p. 1 ff. I think Tacitus wrote: 'gloria maior erat mortalibus aut a. h.' or simply *maior mortalibus*, with the omission of the copula.

Ch. 13, 3: licet illos certamina et pericula sua ad consulatus evexerint.

ad, *corr.* Lipsius; et, ω [ad opes] et consulatus, *add.* Ritter; et [ad sacerdotia (*vel* praeturas)] et consulatus, *ins.* Vahlen.

An *enumeration* of some of the positions which an orator might hope to attain through his eloquence decidedly weakens the force of the passage. I, therefore, emend the MS reading by inserting VEL (written t) before ad consulatus.

Ch. 13, 15: quod adligati omni adulatione.

The majority of critics refuse to accept Walther's emendation *omni* (cū, ABE; cum, CDV). It is, however, perfectly certain, as a glance at the variants in ch. 2, 15 might have shown: omni eruditione (omni, CEV; cū, ABD), for here no other reading is possible. In 26, 31, cod. C has *in omne* for *in commune*, the similarity of the compendium for omne and commune misleading the scribe.

Ch. 13, 23: Me vero *dulces* ut Vergilius ait, *Musae* . . . in illa sacra illosque fontes ferant.

illa—illos, bCDEV; ista—istos, AB; sacra [loca], *add.* Helmreich; [loca] sacra, *John olim*; sacra [nemora], *Mähly*; secreta, *E. Wolff*; illasque frondes, *Haupt* (Op. I 194), *Michaelis*, *Nipperdey*; illosque ad, *Ritter*, *Andresen*, *Halm*, *Müller*, *Wolff*; ad illa—illos, *Baehrens*.

Two objections have been urged against the genuineness of our MS reading. It will be necessary to examine them, as they have led to what I believe to be an unwarranted tampering with a perfectly sound text. In the first place, we are assured that *sacra* is not used in the *local* sense of 'shrines' or 'sacred precincts,' the meaning required here, and the dictionaries, it is true, do not cite any instances. Nevertheless, examples are by no means lacking, even in Tacitus, where the word, as shown by the context, can either have no other signification or where there is, at least, no obstacle to its being so interpreted. Cf. Tac. Hist. III 33: cum



omnia *sacra* profanaque in ignes considerent solum Mefitis *templum* stetit ante moenia *loco* seu numine defensum; Ann. I 54, 4: profana simul et *sacra* et celeberrimum templum . . . *solo aequantur* (also quoted by John, Fleck. Jahrb. 1888, p. 572); Ann. I 79, 6: qui *sacra* et lucos et aras patriis amnibus dicaverint; Pers. Prol. 7: ipse semipaganus | ad *sacra* vaturn carmen affero nostrum; Prop. IV 1, 1: Callimachi Manes et Coi *sacra* Philetæ | In vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.

The other objection is best stated in words of Haupt l. c. "An die quellen der Musen zu denken hat den herausgebern genügt, aber ein bad in diesen quellen will Maternus doch schwerlich nehmen und die wohlfeile kunst (!) mit der man etwa *in fontes* anders erklären möchte, verdient keine ernstliche Berücksichtigung." He thereupon conjectures, on the analogy of 'nemora et lucos' immediately preceding, *illasque frondes*, which he styles "eine überzeugende Verbesserung." And so it has seemed to Michaelis, while subsequent editors, with the exception of Peter, have at least been so far convinced as to admit the existence of a corruption in the text, although they prefer Ritter's conjecture as an easier solution of the alleged difficulty. I have, however, even in the face of this unanimity of opinion, no hesitation in saying that the great critic never conceived a more worthless emendation, and one based on more fanciful grounds, for even supposing his point to be well taken, *frondes* would still have nothing in its favor, as the shrines of the Muses and a neighboring spring are invariably associated (cf. Paus. IX 29, 3; Plut. de Pyth. orac. 17; Livy I 21; Juv. III 13: nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur, with Mayor's note ad loc.), so that we have no right to destroy the traditional collocation in our passage under any circumstances. Nor has the insertion of *ad* any better justification, for if, as is contended, *in fontes* could only mean "into the fountains," one's sympathy is strongly aroused for the dreadful fate of the poor individuals introduced in the following passages: κ 107: ἡ γέν ἀρ' ἐς κρήνην κατέβησεντο καλλιέεθρον, and Prop. III 6, 17: semper *in Oceanum* mittit me quaerere gemmas | et iubet ex ipsa tollere dona Tyro; cp. also K 366: φεύγων ἐς νῆας, i. e. ad castra navalia; O 420: πῦρ ἐς νῆα φέροντα, i. e. *ad*ferentem. In all these cases *in* or *ἐς*=*ad*, towards, *Germ.* 'an,' and this may be the meaning it has in the passage under notice. Inasmuch, however, as the sanctuaries of the Muses were always located on the top of mountains, I prefer to take *in* in the sense of 'up towards,' a significa-

tion which *in* frequently has; cf. e. g. Dial. 10, 20: in arcem ferat; 19, 16: in caelum laudibus ferebatur (certainly not "into" the citadel or "into" heaven); Prop. V 8, 13: si fuerint castae, redeunt in colla parentum (the 'parentes' would unquestionably have preferred the "wohlfeile kunst das *in* anders zu erklären," in this case); Cic. de orat. III 10, 25: tamquam in aram confugitis (so also Nep. Paus. 4, 5). The insertion of *ad* after *illosque* is impossible on stylistic grounds, for the anastrophe of the preposition is confined to the later works of Tacitus (Wölfflin, Phil. 25, 116), and even there the preposition *ad*, in anastrophe, is of extreme rarity, except in certain formulaic expressions such as quem ad modum, while after a demonstrative pronoun, *ad* in anastrophe occurs but once! (cf. H. C. Maué, De praep. *ad* apud Tac. usu, p. 71; A. Gerber, Progr. Glückstadt, 1871). We may therefore conclude that neither Ritter's nor Haupt's "überzeugende Verbesserung" "verdient eine ernstliche Berücksichtigung."

Ch. 13 ext. I read as follows: nec plus habeam quam quod cui velim relinquere, quandoque fatalis et meus dies veniet, statuar tumulo non maestus et atrox sed hilaris et coronatus et pro memoria mei nec consulat quisquam nec roget.

Relinquere quandoque enim veniat (veniet, bp) statuarque, ω; relinquere: quandoque enim . . . statuar, *Hess*; relinquere: quandoque . . . statuarque, *Vahlen*; rel. (quandoque enim—veniet) statuarque, *Halm, Peter, Andresen*; quandoque cient fata licet meus dies veniet, *Baehrens*; [quandoque—veniet], *del. Ritter, glossema Christiani statuens*; enim, *del. Nipperdey, John, Wolff*; quandocunque, p; quandoque olim, *Steiner, Michaelis (olim is, however, never used of the future in Tacitus)*; quando quidem, *coni. Halm*; venerit, *Ernesti*.

The almost obstinate persistency on the part of critics in taking *quandoque* in the sense of *aliquando* or *quandocunque* has been the chief cause of the innumerable misinterpretations and emendations to which this passage has given rise. Everything becomes perfectly clear, if we regard *quandoque* = *et quando*. *Quando* as a temporal conjunction is chiefly poetic (Aen. 6, 138); it is, however, according to Wölfflin's observation (Phil. 25, p. 119 f.), also used in prose whenever the style strikes a higher tone, 'bei gehobener Stimmung,' which is the case here; cf. e. g. Germ. 33; Hist. I 87. The confusion possibly arising out of *quandoque* and

quando-que is no greater than that of quoque=etiam and quo-que, examples of which are very numerous; cf. e. g. Dial. 8, 15. 37, 35. 36; Plaut. Poen. 1235; Cic. de off. I 2, 6; Sall. Cat. 23, 4; 58, 4; Jug. 30; Suet. Aug. 18. *Enim* is a gloss, as John has shown; *et* has the meaning of *etiam*, while the omission of *que* after *statuar* is *logically* called for by the context, the verb being necessarily in the same mood as the following optatives. "Let me not possess more wealth than what I can bequeath to whom I please, and when my final summons too shall come ('und wenn auch mein Sterbestündlein schlägt'), *then let me stand* upon my tomb not sorrowful and fierce of countenance, but joyful and laurel-crowned, and let no one either offer resolutions to my memory in the senate or send petitions to the emperor." With the thought we may also compare a line of Livius Andronicus ap. Gell. III 16, 11, which has, so far as I am aware, been overlooked by the commentators: 'Quando dies adveniet, quem prae-fata Morta est.'

Ch. 14, 14: Me vero, inquit et sermo ipse infinita voluptate affecisset atque id ipsum delectat, etc.

*Et—atque* is an intolerable solecism (cf. Hand, Turs. I 529, 5; Madvig, de fin. p. 388<sup>3</sup>, and Dräger, Hist. Synt. II 81<sup>2</sup>, is practically of the same opinion). Halm's proposition to omit *et*, a mere dittography of the preceding *-it*, solves the difficulty very neatly. Nevertheless, a conjecture of Andresen's (Act. Soc. Lips. I, p. 141 f.) has met with far greater favor. On the supposition that *sermo* must here have the restricted signification which Secundus gave to it a few lines previous, where he draws a distinction between the *sermo* of Aper and the *oratio* of Maternus, Andresen contends that Messalla, courteous gentleman that he is, would not have slighted Maternus by not also mentioning his splendid contribution to the debate just closed, and he therefore writes: et sermo iste *et oratio* infinita voluptate affecisset.

Now, in the first place, there is absolutely no valid reason why Messalla must have used *sermo* in a different sense from what it had just been employed in l. 4: suspicatusque . . . altiorum inter eos esse sermonem, i. e. discourse, conversation, debate. Besides—and this is fatal to the emendation—the addition of *et oratio* necessarily involves the further change of *affecisset* to *affecissent*, for we never find in Tacitus a verb in the singular as the predicate of two substantives joined by *et—et*. But even if instances

of this inconcinnity were found, it could only be justified on the ground that one of the subjects is entitled to the greater emphasis, but this would in our case be open to the identical objection which had caused Andresen to insert *et oratio*!

For *ipse*, the reading of our MSS, Halm's *iste* has generally been accepted. I prefer *ille*, for the delicate irony which John, e. g., discovered in the use of *iste* here, is not apparent to me, and would in any case be altogether out of place in this passage. In the reading of the pronouns *iste*, *ille*, *ipse*, an editor must solely be guided by their well-established usage in Latin, the MSS—and the MS of the Dialogus notably so—being generally most unreliable witnesses, for the confusion between the various forms of these three pronouns is incredibly frequent. The error was unquestionably due to an abbreviation, e. g. Dial. 17, 17 illum, EV ipsum, CD istum, AB (so consistently), i. e. <sup>a</sup>im or <sup>a</sup>i, as we find it in ch. 19, 4 of cod. D, where AB write *ista* and bCDEV *illa*.<sup>1</sup>

Ch. 15, 5: cum oblitus et tuae et fratris tui eloquentiae neminem hoc tempore oratorem esse contenderes [antiquis] eoQUE credo audacius quod . . . non verebaris, etc.

antiquis, *del. Acidalius, Nipp., Baehrens, Wolff*; prae antiquis, *coni. Halm olim, Michaelis*; parem antiquis, *Lipsius, Halm*<sup>a</sup>; atque id eo—*Lipsius, Andresen, Wolff*; si conferretur antiquis, *Joh. Müller*.

The context as well as the pregnant use of *orator* in the Dialogus as applicable only to the speakers of the past (cf. e. g. ch. 14, 16; 26, 17; 30, 28; 32, 9), whereas 'horum temporum disertis, causidicis et advocatis et patronis et quidvis potius quam oratores vocantur,' shows that *antiquis* is altogether superfluous, not to mention that it is not even intelligible as it stands. The word is nothing but a gloss which subsequently found its way into the text, and it owes its origin, as John ingeniously suggests, to some ancient reader who took *contendere* in the sense of *comparare*. But if this be so, the above emendations necessarily collapse, the foundation upon which they are all based being thus taken away. Besides the omission of *antiquis*, the sentence requires a conjunction after *eo*, an asyndeton being quite out of place. I therefore read

<sup>1</sup> The attempt of Binde (de Taciti Dialogo Quaest. Crit., Berlin, 1884, p. 23 ff.) to determine the genuine readings on the basis of the alleged superiority of the X class (A and B) of MSS involves a fatal petitio principii.

eoQUE. The que, i. e.  $\tilde{q}$  was easily omitted, owing to the similar sound of the letter immediately following. Cp. D. 41, 12.

Ch. 17, 23: proximo quidem congiario ipsi vidistis plerosque senes qui a Divo quoque Augusto . . . accepisse congiarium narrabant, ex quo colligi potest et Corvinum ab illis et Asinium audiri potuisse [nam Corvinus in medium usque Augusti principatum, Asinius paene ad extremum duravit], ne dividatis saeculum, etc.

Corvinus—Asinius,  $\omega$ . Asinius—Corvinus, *Borghesi*, Opusc. I, p. 410, *Nipperdey* (R. M. 19, 280 ff.); extremum *pro* medium, *coni. Nipperdey*.

The reading of our MSS has long been admitted to be corrupt, for it involves a gross historical error, an error, too, that cannot be attributed to the author, as he shows himself fully conversant with the biographical detail both of Corvinus and of Pollio (cf. John, *Correspbl.* (Separatabd.) I, p. 8 ff.) Messalla Corvinus was born in 64 B. C. and died 8 A. D.; Asinius Pollio was born 76 B. C. and died 5 A. D. Now, inasmuch as Tacitus dates the beginning of the principatus of Augustus from the year 42 B. C. (cf. *Dial.* 17, 10; *Ann.* I 9), Corvinus, according to our text, must have died as early as 14 B. C., Asinius surviving him!

Borghesi endeavored to do away with this difficulty by transposing the names, an emendation that has met with general favor, and yet the absurdity remains precisely the same, for now Asinius, in place of Messalla, is relegated to the realms of shade long before his time.

Clinton proposed another remedy involving no change at all, but simply a different interpretation of *durare*, which has been and is still generally taken in the sense of *perducere vitam*, which it has in one or possibly two passages in Tacitus: *Ann.* III 16: narratum ab iis qui nostram ad iuventutem duraverunt, and *Agr.* 44: non licuit *durare in hanc* beatissimi saeculi *lucem*, but this is the by no means evident conjecture of Acidalius for the perfectly defensible *in hac luce* of the MSS. Clinton understood *durare* to signify the period up to which Asinius and Corvinus remained before the public as orators! But *durare* as a synonym of *florere* never occurs, and to force this meaning into our passage is pure exegetical sleight-of-hand, in violation of semasiology. Quod volunt, credunt. Unfortunately, moreover, we happen to know that Messalla Corvinus proposed in the senate chamber in the year 2 B. C. that the title

of pater patriae be given to Augustus (cf. Suet. Aug. 58), which is, of course, incompatible with the statement in the text, even supposing *durare*=*florere*.

John, evidently seeing this discrepancy, thereupon proposed to solve the entire difficulty by simply combining Borghesi's and Clinton's suggestions. But this solution must also be rejected for the following reasons: 1. *Durare* cannot signify *florere* under any circumstances. 2. It is very suspicious to find this verb construed with two different prepositions within one small sentence, there being absolutely no conceivable ground for this display of syntactical versatility, the more so, when it is observed that Tacitus never uses *in—usque* in a temporal sense (cf. Wölfflin, Burs. Jahresb. 3, p. 775; Philol. 26, p. 139). 3. If "Asinius in medium usque Augusti principatum . . . duravit" were genuine, one does not understand why Tacitus added the following chronological detail in ch. 38, 19: *exceptis orationibus Asinii quae heredibus Urbinae inscribantur, ab ipso tamen Pollione mediis divi Augusti temporibus habitae*, for nothing can be more absurd than to suppose Aper to have imparted a piece of information to Secundus,<sup>1</sup> which from the passage just quoted must seem an act of supererogation. Now, a close examination of both passages will convince any one, I think, that the words in ch. 38, 19 are eminently suited to the context, while in our passage the statement is both superfluous and gratuitous, especially when it is clear that the words "*ex quo colligi potest et Corvinum ab illis et Asinium audiri potuisse*" have all the chronological precision necessary to permit Aper's hearers to appreciate the point which he desires to establish, but if so, it follows that the clause in ch. 17, 19 is the original which furnished the model for the passage in ch. 38, 19; and, if we finally again recall the insuperable external difficulties under which the clause 'nam—duravit' labors, we shall not hesitate to condemn it as an interpolation. The parenthesis being out of the way, the ellipsis implied before *ne dividatis*, which has repeatedly been misinterpreted, is now also more natural and easy.

Ch. 18 init.: *haec ideo praedixi, ut si quae ex horum oratorum fama gloriaque laus temporibus acquiritur, cum docerem in medio sitam et propiorem nobis quam Ser. Galbae aut C.*

<sup>1</sup> That 36 init.—40, 7 is part of the speech of Secundus will be shown at length in my introduction.

Carboni quosque alios merito antiquos vocaverimus, sunt enim horridi et impoliti et rudes et informes et quos utinam nulla parte imitatus esset Calvus vester aut Caelius aut ipse Cicero.

The reading *imitatus* contains so glaring an absurdity that it is almost incredible that critics who have been by no means slow in discovering flaws in many a perfectly sound reading in the *Dialogus* should have left unnoticed so manifest a corruption as this one. For who ever heard that Caelius or Calvus or Cicero imitated *ulla parte* the uncouth, rugged and unpolished style of any of their early predecessors?

The style of Caelius did indeed lack the perfect polish and idiomatic purity that was found in Calvus or in Cicero. And as Quint. X 2, 25 characterises his diction by the term *asperitas*, Aper's more elaborate criticism in 21, 14 f., making all proper allowance for his exaggerating tendencies, may not have hit very wide of the mark: quid? ex Caelianis orationibus nempe eae placent . . . in quibus nitorem et altitudinem horum temporum agnoscimus. Sordes autem reliquae<sup>1</sup> verborum et hians compositio et inconditi sensus redolent antiquitatem nec quemquam adeo antiquarium puto, ut Caelium ex ea parte laudet qua antiquus est. Nevertheless, this very passage rather suggests the inference that Caelius' unpolished style was due more to want of good taste or literary care than to any conscious imitation of what savored of antiquity, owing to an affected predilection for what was obsolete or antiquated, as was the case with Laelius (cf. Cic. Brut. 22, 83; 24, 93), and notably so with Asinius Pollio.

When we come to Calvus, the *imitatus* of our text is simply ludicrous, Calvus, of whom Cicero, his greatest rival for oratorical leadership, says in his Brut. 82, 253: *accuratius* quoddam genus dicendi et exquisitius adferebat genus quod quamquam scienter eleganterque tractabat *nimum tamen inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque ne vitiosum colligeret* . . . *Atticum* se, inquit, Calvus noster dici volebat. Quint. X 1, 115 calls his diction *castigata* adding *imitator* autem est Atticorum, which Seneca, Controv. VII 4, 6, confirms when he tells us of Calvus that "compositio quoque eius in actionibus ad *exemplum Demosthenis riget*." And yet we are asked to believe that Tacitus put

<sup>1</sup>*Reliquae* is the evident emendation of Sorof (De codd. Aeschlyli, Berl. Diss. 1881, Thesis) for *regule* in ABD (illae, CEV<sub>2</sub>). The corrupted reading grew out of a metathesis.

into the mouth of one of the interlocutors the assertion that this same orator *imitated*, partially at least, the genus dicendi of a Galba or Carbo, characterised by an accumulation of epithets, every one of which is, so far as Calvus is concerned, contradicted by Cicero's Brutus, the very work to which the author of the Dialogus is chiefly indebted for his material! Credat Judaeus Apella!

And what are we to say to the preposterous statement that Cicero himself was found among the imitators of these early orators! a statement refuted by Cicero's own words (cf. e. g. Brut. 90, 310), and by every line of his that has come down to us, although it may be readily admitted that the great orator did not attain to stylistic perfection at one bound. Cicero was a profound student of the history of Roman oratory, as his rhetorical works abundantly prove, and fortunately some of his criticisms on the style of the very men whom he is said to have imitated are still extant. Cf. e. g. Brut. 21, 82: sed inter hos . . . sine controversia Ser. Galba praestitit sed nescio quomodo huius exiliores orationes sunt et redolentes magis antiquitatem quam aut Laeli aut Scipionis aut etiam ipsius Catonis, itaque exaruerunt, vix iam ut appareant. De orat. III 8, 28: asperitatem Galbae. Brut. 27, 104: nam et Carbonis et Gracchi habemus orationes nondum satis splendidas verbis sed acutas prudentiaeque plenissimas. But such a clear recognition of the stylistic shortcomings of his early predecessors simply precludes conscious imitation. Outside of these deficiencies, however, Cicero always speaks of them in terms of intense *admiration*; aye, so exaggerated was this estimate that he lets Atticus rebuke him for it and confine it within more accurate limits; cf. Brut. 86, 295 ff. That his contemporaries shared this admiration, for it pertained to qualities independent of their style, must be inferred from Aper's language in 22 init.: Ad Ciceronem venio cui eadem pugna cum aequalibus suis fuit quae mihi vobiscum est, *illi* enim antiquos *mirabantur*, ipse suorum temporum eloquentiam anteponebat.<sup>1</sup> This furnishes the key to the emendation of the corruption. Tacitus, I feel convinced, wrote 'quos utinam nulla parte *MIRATUS* esset Calvus vester aut Caelius aut ipse Cicero.' Aper cannot understand how orators such as Galba, Carbo, Cato, etc., should, nevertheless, have elicited admiration, for, from his point of view, beauty of language and senten-

<sup>1</sup> This latter statement is, of course, even if it be authentic, not incompatible with a sincere admiration for his predecessors, as we have seen.



tious diction constituted the essential and prerequisite qualifications of the true orator, in both of which such men as Galba and Carbo were, of course, sadly deficient.

*Mirari* and *imitari* closely resemble each other in minuscule MSS, and they were accordingly confounded very frequently; cf. e. g. Ovid, Her. II 72; Quint. X 2, 7; Lucan, IX 807; Martial, I 39, 5; Servius, Verg. Aen. VIII 517 Th.<sup>1</sup>

Ch. 20, 3: Quis nunc feret oratorem de infirmitate valetudinis suae praefantem? qualia sunt fere principia Corvini.

*Fere* or *ferme*, the form preferred by Tacitus in his later works, never has the force of an adjective, whether we take it in its usual sense or in that of *plerumque*, which it is supposed to have here. It is always an adverb, pure and simple. This being so, I feel convinced that OMNIA dropped out of the text, and I therefore write: qualia sunt OMNIA fere principia Corvini, an emendation which derives no little support from the following almost identical passage in Quint. IV 1, 8: si nos infirmos, imparatos impares agentium contra ingeniis dixerimus, *qualia sunt pleraque Messallae prooemia*, etc.<sup>2</sup> On the analogy of Ann. 3, 76, 4 *ferme* cunctos proceres, and Ann. 14, 20, 3 *ut cuncta ferme nova*, one might also be tempted to insert *cuncta* in place of *omnia*, were it not for the singular fact that this adjective, though frequent enough in Tacitus from the *Agricola* downwards, never occurs in the *Dialogus* except *once* in the formulaic or proverbial phrase *agunt feruntque cuncta* (Dial. 20, 8; cf. also Hist. I 2, 19 [cum delatores] *agerent verterent cuncta*). For the omission of *omnia* cf. e. g. Quint. X 1, 106.

Ch. 20, 6: praecurrit hoc tempore iudex dicentem et nisi aut cursu argumentorum aut colore sententiarum aut nitore et cultu descriptionum invitatus et corruptus est, aversatur.

The *ubertas*, not to say *abundantia dicendi* which is so characteristic a feature of the *Dialogus*, is perhaps nowhere more conspicuous than in the very numerous instances of tautological or at best pleonastic combinations of substantives, adjectives and

<sup>1</sup>According to Cornelissen, the same confusion took place in Dial. 23, 4: quae tamen sola mirantur atque exprimunt. He therefore reads *im antur*, on the supposed analogy of Quint. X 2, 18. But this conjecture is refuted by the observation that Tacitus does not join synonymous verbs by *atque*. See below.

<sup>2</sup>This defence looks suspiciously like an answer to Aper's criticism; cp. also Quint. VI 3, 4 and Dial. 23 init.

verbs. Now, it is a very singular thing to observe, what has hitherto escaped notice, that Tacitus in the *Dialogus* always uses the conjunction *et* to combine two more or less synonymous verbs closely. Cf. e. g. 4, 3 *agitare et insequi*; 7, 8 *tueri et defendere*; 8, 24; 9, 16 *excudit et elucubrav*; 9, 17, 31; 11, 8; 17, 19; 17, 31 *agnoscere ac velut coniungere et copulare*; 22, 22; 26, 36; 30, 26; 32, 6 *scientia . . . nos ornat atque eminet et excellit*; 33, 9; 39, 24. Wherever, on the other hand, one of the closely connected verbs carries on the thought of the other, *atque*, which very often has a progressive or intensive force, takes the place of *et*. Cf. 6, 27: *serantur atque elaborentur* (sown and then cultivated); 15, : *inridere atque contemnere* (ridicule precedes contempt); 15, 12: *scrutetur ac reddat* (let him inquire and then furnish us with the results of his investigations); 23, 4: *sola mirantur atque exprimunt* (admiration leads to imitation). I have noticed but *two* exceptions, which, on closer inspection, however, admirably confirm the observation; 5, 14: *parere simul et tueri amicitias*, and 5, 29: *propugnare pariter et incessere*. Here one would certainly expect *atque*, were it not that the insertion of *simul* and *pariter* has the effect of making the action expressed by the two verbs appear simultaneous, coalescing, as it were, into one idea. But if this observation is true, then *invitatus et corruptus* cannot be the genuine reading, for so far from being tautological, the two verbs stand in the relation of cause and effect. An easy way out of this difficulty would be the substitution of *atque* for *et*, the two conjunctions being frequently confounded; cf. e. g. *Dial.* 18, 27; 21, 16 *Mich.* I hesitate to apply this remedy, however, because the verb *invitatus* itself seems out of place here. As the context shows, the stylistic qualities mentioned by Aper, however desirable or admirable they are generally considered to be, are here said to exert a *corrupting* influence upon the judges. Now *invitatus* in this figurative sense, as far as I have been able to discover, is used only of allurements of a harmless or beneficial nature, and hence frequently joined with *allicere*. This being so, I write with only a very slight change *VITIATUS et corruptus*. The identical collocation is found, e. g. in *Cic. pro Sestio*, 54, 115. The origin of the corruption is very apparent. The *in* is a dittography of the preceding *m* in *descriptionum*, just as in the precisely analogous passage in 9, 29, all our MSS read *suum ingenium* for the only genuine reading *suum genium*, and again, in 18, 6 one MS has *utinam in nulla* for *utinam nulla*. This error

once committed, the *i* was naturally dropped, the very familiar *invitatus* taking the place of *invitiatus*, which is no Latin word, nor are there examples lacking, if any be needed, of similar omissions of *i* in the 'inlaut.' Cf. e. g. Dial. 25, : antiquorum in all our MSS for antiquorum, and 39, s the cod. Farnesianus (C) has virum for virium.

Ch. 22, 23: quaedam vero procul arceantur ut iam oblitterata et OBSOLETA.

olentia, ω; exoleta, *Acidalius*; antiquitatem olentia, *Andresen*; situm olentia, *Th. Vogel*.

The reading of our MSS admits of no satisfactory explanation. E. Wolff, the latest editor of the *Dialogus* (Perthes, Gotha, 1890), has therefore taken the easy emendation *obsoleta* into his text, and both Andresen and P. Langen have given him their weighty approval. Under these circumstances, I feel warranted in drawing attention to the fact that this conjecture was proposed by the writer as early as 1888 (cf. *De Heroidum Ovidii codice* Planudeo, Berl. Diss. Thesis VII). On the use of *obsoleta*, cf. Cic. de orat. III 30, 9: oratio paullo obsoletior; ibid. III 37, 150: illa laus oratoris ut abiecta et obsoleta fugiat; in Verr. I 1, 31, 56: nimis antiqua et iam obsoleta videantur; Quint. IV 1, 58: ab obsoleta vetustate sumptum. *Obsoleta* is preferable to *exoleta* for three reasons: (1) It is an easier correction of *olentia*; (2) it retains the alliteration of which Tacitus is extremely fond, not only in the *Dialogus*, but in his later works as well (cf. Weinkauff's lists, p. 43 ff., and pp. 48-56; (3) it is metaphorically closely allied to *oblitterata*, a rhetorical device observable in so many of Tacitus' synonymous collocations.

Ch. 25, 10: sed quomodo inter Atticos oratores primae Demostheni tribuuntur, proximum autem locum Aeschines et Hyperides et Lysias et Lycurgus optinent, omnium autem concessu haec oratorum aetas maxime probatur, sic apud nos Cicero quidem ceteros eorundem temporum disertos antecessit, Calvus autem et Asinius . . . iure et prioribus et sequentibus anteponuntur.

The editors of the *Dialogus* have with singular unanimity rejected the first *autem*, objecting to its repetition before concessu. It is, however, intrinsically improbable that so totally superfluous a word as *autem* would have been inserted in this place, no motive for such an interpolation being conceivable. I believe the second

*autem* to be a corruption of TAMEN, due to metathesis or an illegible compendium. So in Tac. Ann. XIII 25, 14 some editors write *autem*, others *tamen*, the codex Mediceus reading either *aū* (according to Orelli) or *tu*, which, however, generally stands for *tum*. In Dial. 41, 15, we find the same confusion, for there *autem* is unquestionably the genuine reading for *tamen*, CDEV; inde, AB, cp. Michaelis ad loc. Substituting *tamen*, Messalla's point is at once brought out with remarkable clearness, which *autem* entirely obscures. Although Demosthenes was considered *primus omnium*, and not *primus inter pares*, yet (*tamen*) his age was, by common consent, regarded as marking the culmination of Greek oratory, so the age of Cicero marks a similar climax in Roman eloquence, even though the contemporaries of Cicero were greatly inferior to him. Therefore, concludes Messalla, 'nec refert quod inter se specie differunt, cum genere consentiant.'

Ch. 29, 9: quin etiam ipsi (*malim* ipsi quin etiam) parentes non probitati neque modestiae parvulos assuefaciunt sed lasciviae et dicacitati per quae paulatim impudentia inrepat [et sui alienique contemptus].

The meaning of *sui alienique* is apparent from the following passages: Sall. Cat. 5, 4: alieni adpetens, sui profusus; ibid. 12, 2: sua parvi pendere, aliena cupere; Tac. Hist. I 4, 9: pecuniae alienae adpetens, sui profusus (a clear imitation of Sallust); Cic. de orat. I 38, 173: cum omnino quid *suum* quid *alienum*, qua re denique civis aut peregrinus, servus aut liber quispiam sit, *ignoret*, insignis est *impudentiae*. Illa vero deridenda arrogantia est in minoribus navigiis rudem esse se confiteri, quinqueremes aut etiam maiores gubernare didicisse.

Now, this signification cannot be made to suit the context, as Peter ad loc. has irrefutably demonstrated. The same scholar thereupon proceeds to argue that *sui alienique* can only be made intelligible by taking it in the sense of intellectual, not material, property, and he adds, without observing the fatal self-contradiction, "neben *alieni* kann *sui* nur der genetiv von *suum* sein"! But the neuter gen. *alieni* can never do duty for *aliorum* or *alienorum*, nor was Peter able to adduce a single parallel instance of this use. Again, it must be noted that Peter's interpretation is open to a psychological objection, for *impudentia* and *contemptus sui* are rarely found in combination, if not actually incompatible. The entire clause is an interlinear gloss of the very kind that one

might expect from a monkish scribe, partly suggested, perhaps, by the Ciceronian passage just quoted. The very position of the words seems also, in a measure, to confirm this suspicion, for a *predicate* verb in the *singular*, placed between two subjects (not proper names), seems to occur but *once* in Tacitus. Cf. Hist. III 10, 16: *namque et facundia aderat mulcendique volgum artes et auctoritas*.<sup>1</sup>

Ch. 32, 13: *quod adeo neglegitur ab horum temporum disertis . . . ut ignorent leges, non teneant senatus consulta, ius civitatis ultro derideant*.

*Ius civitatis* is quite unintelligible. Commentators have, therefore, suggested to interpret the phrase in the sense of *ius civile*, as opposed to *ius gentium*, but this signification of *civitatis* is not found elsewhere, so that Wolff, who also adopts it, has had to take refuge in an imaginary and gratuitous "peculiarity of Tacitus" ("eine Taciteische Besonderheit")! Baehrens, as usual, cuts the knot by boldly substituting *civile* for *civitatis*. I have not the slightest doubt that Tacitus wrote: *ius suae civitatis*. Cp. Cic. de orat. I 40, 184: *haec igitur et horum similia iura suae civitatis ignorent*. *Suae* easily dropped out between *ius* and *civitatis*. So also in Quint. X 1, 100. *suae*, though essential to the context, is omitted in most MSS.

Ch. 35, 10: *in quibus non facile dixerim, utrumne locus ipse an condiscipuli an genus studiorum plus mali ingeniis afferant*.

Tacitean usage in disjunctive clauses seems to call for either "an genus studiorum an condiscipuli . . . afferant," or what is a more probable because an easier change—*afferat*.

Ch. 36, 2: *magna eloquentia sicut flamma materia alitur et motibus excitatur et urendo clarescit*.

The climax of this beautiful simile is totally destroyed by an intolerable tautology, for *clarescit* is but another expression for what had already been distinctly stated by *motibus excitatur*.

<sup>1</sup> The only other passage that might possibly be cited for the 'collocatio verborum' under notice is Dial. 7, 15, which is generally read: *quibus modo et recta indoles est et bona spes sui*. But apart from the fact that the two substantives are joined by *et—et*, not *et*, it is certainly significant that the MSS vary considerably in their readings [*modo recta et indoles* ACD, *et add.* B om. CV, *est om.* EV, *sit* Michaelis]. These variants rather point to the following text as the original: *modo recta est indoles et bona spes sui*.

What is needed to complete the thought, whether we take it in its metaphorical meaning or regard it as descriptive merely of a physical process, is the idea of *heat, ardor*, "*Gluth*." 'Fire is nourished by its material, it is fanned into a flame by breezes, and waxes warm in the burning.' That this is the proper sequence may be demonstrated by a passage from Cic. Brut. 24, 93, which will be readily recognised as Tacitus' model: Quem [sc. Galbam] fortasse vis non ingenii solum sed etiam animi et naturalis quidam dolor dicentem incendebat efficiebatque, ut et incitata et gravis et vehemens esset oratio; dein cum otiosus stilum prehenderet motusque omnis animi tamquam ventus defecerat, flaccescebat oratio . . . ardor animi non semper adest, isque cum consedit, omnis illa vis et quasi flamma oratoris exstinguitur.

The difficulty just pointed out vanishes at once, if for the objectionable *clarescit* we substitute, with a very slight departure from the MS reading, CALESCIT, an emendation, moreover, strongly confirmed by Dial. 22, 13: *tarde commovetur, raro incalescit*, where we observe the same progression of thought required in our passage and couched in almost identical language. Cp. also the frequent collocation *excitare et inflammare* (e. g. Cic. pro Pomp. 2 de Harusp. resp. 1, 19).<sup>1</sup>

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

<sup>1</sup>This had long been written when I came upon the following short note in Mähly's *Observ. de Drusi atque Maecenatis Epicediis deque Taciteo Dialogo Criticae*, Basle, 1873, p. 23: "*excidit ex comparatione flammae clarescit* quam comparationem ut plenam et integram restituamus, ni fallor, urendo calescit." But the *only* reason here given for the emendation strikes wide of the mark, for *clarescit* is, on the contrary, very appropriate when applied to a flame. The weakness of Mähly's objection is unquestionably the reason why editors of the *Dialogus* have persistently ignored his conjecture. Under these circumstances, I felt warranted in again drawing attention to what I consider an evident and necessary emendation, especially as it was reached independently of Mähly, and on grounds which will, I hope, insure its general acceptance.